



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/604,974 | 10/29/2003 | Robert O'Kane | 001-205 | 1973 |
| 29569 | 7590 | 10/04/2007 | | |
| FURR LAW FIRM 2622 DEBOLT ROAD UTICA, OH 43080 | | | EXAMINER NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2623 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/04/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/604,974 | O'KANE, ROBERT | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba | 2623 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed October 29, 2003.
2. Claims 1-2 have been examined. Claims 1 and 2 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) as follows:

It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. 60/319,506, filed August 28, 2002. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence(s) of the specification of this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121, or 365(c). See 37 CFR 1.78(a). For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of all nonprovisional applications. If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference to the prior application must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national

stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A benefit claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

If the reference to the prior application was previously submitted within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 1.78(a), but not in the first sentence(s) of the specification or an application data sheet (ADS) as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a) (e.g., if the reference was submitted in an oath or declaration or the application transmittal letter), and the information concerning the benefit claim was recognized by the Office as shown by its inclusion on the first filing receipt, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a) and the surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t) are not required. Applicant is still required to submit the reference in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78(a) by filing an amendment to the first sentence(s) of the specification or an ADS. See MPEP § 201.11.

Oath/Declaration

4. The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed and dated Oath/Declaration filed October 29, 2003.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to because the drawing does not have a top margin of at least 2.5 cm (1 inch), a left-side margin of 2.5 cm (1 inch) and a right-side margin of at least 1.5 cm (5/8 inch). See 37 CFR § 1.84(g).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which Applicant may become aware in the specification.

7. The specification is objected to because of the following minor informalities:

- a. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
- b. The Abstract contains numerous typographical, spelling and grammatical errors.

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

- c. The specification contains an inordinate amount of typographical and spelling errors.
- d. The use of trademarks, such as Napster ([0007]), Neilson [sic] ([0014]) has been noted in this application. Trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in a manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

To expedite correction on this matter, the examiner suggests the following guidelines for Applicant to follow in amending the specification:

- i. capitalize each letter of a trademark or accompany the trademark with an appropriate designation symbol, e.g., TM or ®, as appropriate;
- ii. use each trademark as an adjective modifying a description noun.

For example, it would be appropriate to recite “the JAVA platform” or “the JAVA programming language.” Note that in these examples, “platform” and “programming language” provide accompanying generic terminology, describing the context in which the trademark is used. By itself, the trademark JAVA specifies only the source of the so-labeled products, namely SUN Microsystems, Inc.

Claim Objection

- 8. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following minor informalities: the term “acknowledgement” is mis-typed.

Claim 1 is objected to because the claim recites “a process” comprising “digital

acknowledgment trigger.” Since the trigger is neither clearly defined in the claim nor in the specification, the “trigger” is interpreted to mean “something that acts like a mechanical trigger in initiating a process or reaction,” Miriam-Webster, online dictionary. Thus a trigger being “something,” e.g., an apparatus cannot be a method step in the method claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 2 recite “a digital acknowledgment trigger.” This limitation is nowhere defined in the specification.

11. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

It is unclear as to how the digital acknowledgment works without a written description of “digital acknowledgment trigger” either in the claim or in the specification.

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 2 recites the limitation “a digital acknowledgment trigger.” It is unclear what is the trigger in this context, e.g., is it a bit in a bitstream, a keyword in a sentence, or an electrical signal?

14. A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In *Ex parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ 2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990), a claim directed to an automatic transmission workstand and the method steps of using it was held to be ambiguous and properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In Claim 1, it is unclear whether an apparatus (e.g., “trigger”) or a process (e.g., “process”) is claimed. With a process recited in the preamble, one would expect to find in the body of the claim different steps to perform the process. However, one only found that the process comprises a trigger, i.e., an apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

15. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

16. Pursuant to Claim 1, a single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus should also be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, *Ex parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ 2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter 1990), based on the theory that the claim is directed to neither a “process” nor a “machine,” but rather overlaps two different statutory classes of invention set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only. *Id.* At 1551.

Correction is required.

17. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Supreme Court has ruled that to be statutory, a claimed process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation for which a practical application is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application which produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result.. See Diehr, 450 U.S. at 183-84, 209 USPQ at 6 (quoting Cochran v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) (“A [statutory] process is a mode of treatment of certain materials to produce a given result. It is an act, or a series of acts, performed upon the subject matter to be transformed and reduced to a different state or thing.... The process requires that certain things should be done with certain substances, and in certain order; but the tools to be used in doing this may be of secondary consequence.”). See also Alappat, 33 F.3d at 1543, 31 USPQ2d at 1556-57 (quoting Diehr, 450 U.S. at 192, [209 USPQ at 10]). See also *id.* at 1569, 31 USPQ2d at 1578-79 (Newman, J., concurring)(“unpatentability of the principle does not defeat patentability of its practical applications”)(citing O’Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 114-19).

i. “Practical Application of an Abstract Idea”

While the Supreme Court has ruled that “transformation” is relevant to a section 101 inquiry, the Court has expressly refused to hold that it is the only test for determining patent eligibility. The Federal Circuit has provided further guidance in distinguishing between the judicially-created exceptions to patentable subject matter and eligible subject matter. The focus of the inquiry is whether the claim, considered as a whole, constitutes “a practical application of an abstract idea.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1600. Thus, the question of whether a claim encompasses statutory subject matter should not focus on which category of subject matter a claim is directed to (e.g., process or machine), “but rather on the essential characteristics of the subject matter, in particular its practical utility.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1375, 47 USPQ2d at 1602; see also AT&T, 172 F.3d at 1360, 50 USPQ2d at 1453 (focus on section 101 inquiry is “whether the mathematical algorithm was applied in a practical manner”). Accordingly, an “abstract idea” when practically applied to a useful end is eligible for a patent. State Street, 149 F.3d at 1374, 47 USPQ2d at 1601 (“a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter employing a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or abstract idea is patentable subject matter even though a law of nature, natural phenomenon, or abstract idea would not, by itself, be entitled to such protection.”)(emphasis added); see also Alappat, 33 F.3d at 1543, 31, USPQ2d at 1556-57 (holding that “certain types of mathematical subject matter, standing alone, represent nothing more than abstract ideas until reduced to some type of practical application, and thus that subject matter is not, in and of itself, entitled to patent protection.”).

ii. “Useful, Concrete and Tangible Result”

In State Street, the Federal Circuit examined some of its prior section 101 cases, observing that the claimed inventions in those cases were each for a “practical application of an abstract idea” because the elements of the invention operated to produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. For example, the court in State Street noted that the claimed invention in Alappat “constituted a practical application of an abstract idea (a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation), because it produced ‘a useful, concrete and tangible thing – the condition of a patient’s heart.’” Id.

In determining whether the claim is for a “practical application,” the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result is “useful, tangible and concrete.” The Federal Circuit further ruled that it is of little relevance whether a claim is directed to a machine or process for the purpose of a § 101 analysis. AT&T, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1451.

In Claim 1, it is unclear as to whether the final result of “the process comprising a digital acknowledgment trigger” is useful, concrete and tangible. Claim 1 is completely silent as to the intended use (i.e., useful), as to the predictability (i.e., concrete), and as to the practicality (i.e., tangible) of the final result.

In Claim 2, it is unclear as to whether the final result of “generat[ing] a digital acknowledgment trigger” is useful, concrete and tangible. Claim 2 is completely silent as to the intended use (i.e., useful), as to the predictability (i.e., concrete), and as to the practicality (i.e., tangible) of the final result.

18. The invention claimed in Claims 1 and 2 lacks patentable utility. See discussion in paragraph 15 above.

19. The disclosed invention claimed in Claims 1 and 2 is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

20. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejection under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

21. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0092015 by Sprunk et al. (Sprunk”).

Claim 1

Sprunk discloses *a process comprising a digital acknowledgment trigger* (see at least Abstract; FIGs. 15A-C; [0047-0048]).

Claim 2

Sprunk discloses *a device which generates a digital acknowledgment trigger* (see at least Abstract; FIGs. 15A-C; [0047-0048]).

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu "Antony" Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached at (571) 272-7353.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2600 Group receptionist (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).



ANTONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

September 26, 2007